Case 4:12-cr-00456-PJH Document 21 Filed 06/21/12 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. 12-0456 PJH
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
KHOA DANG TRAN	JUN 2 1 2012
Defendant.	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
continuance outweigh the best interest of the p	ord on June 21, 2012, the Court excludes time under the July 1, 2012 and finds that the ends of justice served by the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factors:
Failure to grant a continuance w See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i	would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. i).
or law, that it is unreasonable to	mplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial blished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance w taking into account the exercise	would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance w counsel's other scheduled case of See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i	yould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. iv).
Failure to grant a continuance w necessary for effective preparation See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i	yould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (v).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	1/
DATED: 6/21/12	KANDIS A. WESTMORE United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED KANDALI KU6X Attorney for Defendant	Brian C. Sluis Brian C. Lewis Assistant United States Attorney